

# SDNPA Planning Committee – 13 December 2018

## Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
3	5	Minute 205	Amendment: 205. Anthony Watts Williams declared an interest in agenda item 8 9 was he was acquainted with Councillor Tim Bryant, one of the public speakers.	Error
7	16	4.7	Additional comment received from Environmental Health, as follows: No objection in principle, given close location of other residential properties no construction activities should take place outside of 8am-6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm Saturdays. (Officer note – this would be covered by condition no.7- Construction Management Plan.)	Update
7	5.1		<p>4 additional objections have been received from individuals who have previously commented. These re-iterate concerns already included in the report and provide additional points summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses will be out of reach local young people and help meet local need.</li> <li>• Does not conserve landscape and scenic beauty.</li> <li>• Heavy vehicles visiting nearby Council Depot and Travis Perkins will impact upon amenities of new dwellings and hazardous for access/egress.</li> <li>• Poor broadband speeds in the area.</li> <li>• Would visually extend the village envelope towards the roundabout to the south.</li> <li>• No safe crossing point on Long Furlong Road</li> </ul> <p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-design of the terrace resulted in uglier building.</li> <li>• Architecture/materials don't tie in with surroundings.</li> <li>• Houses will be small and cramped.</li> <li>• Poor bin storage.</li> <li>• Poor parking arrangements (number and dimensions- don't allow for any larger vehicles than cars).</li> <li>• North facing gardens and their size are inappropriate and will be overlooked and cause noise and disturbance.</li> <li>• Bungalows would be more appropriate to meet local resident's needs.</li> </ul>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density development in comparison to surroundings and on the edge of the village, which will harm views into/out of Clapham.</li> <li>• No renewable technologies proposed.</li> <li>• No surface water management proposals despite flooding in Clapham.</li> </ul>	
7	19	6.3	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>Government policy relating to National Parks is set out in English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was issued and came into effect on <del>27 March 2012</del> <b>24 July 2018</b>. The Circular and NPPF confirm that National Parks have the highest status of protection and the NPPF states at paragraph <del>45</del> <b>172</b> that great weight should be given to conserving <b>and enhancing</b> landscape and scenic beauty in the national parks and that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations and should also be given great weight in National Parks.</p>	Correction
8	37	10.1	<p>11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme detailing the treatment of foul water, including the proposed sewage treatment plant, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory foul water arrangements.</p>	Further condition
8	37	10.1	<p>1. The discharge of domestic sewage associated with this development is likely to require an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (EPR 2010) from the Environment Agency.</p>	Informative
9	.	.	<p><u>Response from the Applicant's agent to the committee report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncritically taken on board the views of the EHDC Economic Development Service.</li> <li>• Previous appeal Inspector considered that (1) other than not marketing the freehold of the site the marketing campaign had been robust; (2) not raised concerns about the design.</li> <li>• The Applicant is disadvantaged that views of consultees are included in the report but responses from the Applicant's consultant team have not been. (Officer note – these relate to landscape, design and the Flood Authority).</li> <li>• Policy SD35 is not adopted and inappropriate to give it greater weight than adopted policy. Current adopted policy requires a minimum of 6 months marketing. Site has also been marketed prior to 2018.</li> <li>• Critique of the design does not include any consideration of the views of the Applicant's consultant team.</li> </ul>	Further information

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot reconcile the design criticism with preference for the site to be developed for industrial employment.</li> <li>• Criticisms of the proposals in terms of the needs of the residents is unjustified in contrast to the Applicant's extensive experience and award of costs may be sought.</li> <li>• Less urban feel proposed compared to the Appeal scheme which wasn't refused on design grounds.</li> <li>• No fundamental issues on flood risk have been raised and are matters which could be dealt with via planning condition.</li> <li>• Insufficient justification to require a financial contribution regarding loss of employment. This requirement would not accord with CIL regulations and an award of costs may be sought.</li> <li>• The proposed development options within the viability/marketing exercise are wholly acceptable to best illustrate a range of design solutions. In any event, it is the amount of floor space derived from the development scenarios which is key for viability testing and this does not appear to be contested.</li> </ul>	
9	47	5.1	<p>3 representations in support have been received, of which 2 are from new respondents to the application. Additional comments from those already outlined in the report are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not want another factory on site, previously been subject to noise, dust and smells.</li> <li>• Re-development for commercial purposes would be a retrograde step, detrimental to Petersfield.</li> <li>• Plenty of other locations suitable for similar commercial uses.</li> <li>• Too many HGVs visiting the adjacent occupied premises, which often park in the entrance to Paris House as no further space in the road to wait.</li> <li>• Site ideal for housing as there are dwellings on two sides of the site and on the opposite side of Frenchmans Road.</li> <li>• Other specialist housing further away from the town centre and the Harrier Way development too remote from the town centre.</li> <li>• Petersfield has a real community spirit and residents would not have to travel far to engage with the rest of the community.</li> <li>• Providing specialist housing could release existing houses and reduce the need to build new homes on greenfield sites.</li> </ul>	Update
9	49	6.3	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>Government policy relating to National Parks is set out in English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was issued and came into effect on <del>27 March 2012</del> <b>24 July 2018</b>. The Circular and NPPF confirm that National Parks have the highest status of protection and the NPPF states at</p>	Correction

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			paragraph 172 that great weight should be given to conserving <b>and enhancing</b> landscape and scenic beauty in the national parks and that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations and should also be given great weight in National Parks.	
9	59	8.61	<p>Amend paragraph:</p> <p>If the application were to be approved, EHDC have requested that an economic contribution of <b>£358,510 (based on a calculation from the EHDC Guide to Developers Contributions 2014)</b> aimed at mitigating the impact of the loss of employment land and enabling the unemployed to secure local jobs is provided. This would be spent to support existing or new programmes carried out by EHDC to create jobs and training. <del>A figure for the contribution has not however been provided by EHDC to discuss with the applicant.</del> <b>The agent has queried whether a contribution is required. It is considered that this contribution would be supported by adopted policies and is compliant with the tests in paragraph 122 of the CIL regulations insofar as it would be directly related to the development, necessary to make the development acceptable and would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.</b> <del>Specifically, However,</del> <b>In the absence of an agreement to secure this contribution</b> a further reason for refusal is proposed.</p>	Update
9	60	10.1	<p><u>Amend reason for refusal no.3 as follows:</u></p> <p>In the absence of a completed legal agreement, the proposals fail to secure a financial contribution towards the mitigation of the loss of the site as an employment land allocation through the re-provision of sites elsewhere and local employment initiatives. The proposals are therefore contrary to <del>policy</del> <b>policies CP4 and CP32</b> of the East Hampshire District Local Plan Joint Core Strategy 2014, <b>policy BP2 of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016</b>, and the East Hampshire District Guide to Developer's Contributions 2014.</p>	Correction